

## R E M A R K S

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 25 and 29, and rejected claims 3-30 under 35 USC §103(a). These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

To expedite prosecution, claims 3, 6, 11, 14 and 21 have been amended to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 22, 23 and 28-30 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 11-21 and 24-27 are now pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-30 UNDER 35 USC §103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3-30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Angles et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,933,811) in combination with Minor et al. (U.S. Patent 5,740,252). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Claim 3 pertains to a system for delivering customized web pages to users. The system of claim 3 includes at least one content server and a centralized demographic server. According to claim 3, “said content server directs a requesting user to said demographic server where particular demographic information associated with the requesting user is stored, said demographic server then retrieves the particular demographic information associated with the requesting user, and then the retrieved particular demographic information is provided to said content server.” Claim 3, lines 7-11.

Hence, the particular demographic information associated with the requesting user is retrieved from the centralized demographics server and provided to said content server. In contrast, Angles et al. teaches accessing an advertisement provider computer. Such advertisement provider computer generates a custom advertisement based on a

customer's profile. The custom advertisement is then combined with the offering from the content provider computer and displayed to the customer.

In contrast, Angles et al. merely provides customized advertisements. As a result, Angles et al. does not teach or suggest retrieving particular demographic information associated with a requesting user from a centralized demographic server and providing same to a content server.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Angles et al. fails to teach "a centralized demographic server that stores demographic information on a plurality of registered users, the demographic information being self-represented." In an effort to overcome this deficiency, the Examiner combined Minor et al. with Angles et al. To support such combination of references, the Examiner stated:

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated the centralized server, as taught by Minor into the customization system of Angles for the purpose of enabling uniform service to multiple users.

However, Minor et al. does not teach or suggest use of a demographic server that is separate from the entry web site 32A or a remote web site 34A. Further, the remote web site 34A does not interact with another server (e.g., a central demographics server) to request or acquire demographic information. Instead, Minor et al. simply provides a method for passing demographic information between web sites in an encrypted manner. As such, Minor et al. also does not teach or suggest retrieving particular demographic information associated with a requesting user from a centralized demographic server and providing same to a content server.

Moreover, there is no motivation to combine Minor et al. with Angles et al. in the manner proposed by the Examiner. Angles et al. pertains to an advertisement system that can provide customized electronic advertisements on web pages displayed on user computers, while Minor et al. pertains to techniques for passing demographic information between computers by associating a computer operator with a set of demographic information. The advertisement system of Angles et al. already makes use of

demographic information; therefore, Angles et al. has no need to make any use of the techniques for passing demographic information described in Minor et al.

Additionally, claim 3 further recites:

wherein said demographic server requires authentication of the requesting user before the particular demographic information can be provided to said content server,

wherein the content server causes the retrieved particular demographic information to be stored on a user's computer associated with the requesting user, and

wherein said content server thereafter utilizes the stored retrieved particular demographic information from the user's computer for at least one subsequent web page request.

Neither Angles et al. nor Minor et al. teaches or suggests such limitations. The Examiner makes reference to Angles et al., col. 11, lines 5-26; however, such merely mentions cookies as being assigned a unique member code. Besides such value, the cookies mentioned also have an expiration date and domain (for which the cookie is valid). Hence, the references to "cookies" in Angles et al. does not teach or suggest storage of the particular demographic information (retrieved from a centralized demographics server) to be stored on a user's computer. The Examiner also makes reference to Angles et al., col. 20, line 45 through col. 21, line 24, which pertains to an advertising module 62 which can make use of a consumer's profile in the registration database 60 to determine an appropriate customized advertisement. Here, in Angles et al., the processing is on an advertisement provider computer 18. Thus, there is no notion in Angles et al. of acquiring demographic information retrieved from a centralized demographics server (after authentication), storing the demographic information on a user's computer, and then thereafter utilizing the stored particular demographic information from the user's computer for at least one subsequent web page request.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 3 is patentably distinct from Angles et al., alone or in combination with Minor et al.

Claims 15 and 21 recite similar limitation to that noted above regarding claim 3. Claim 15 pertains to a computer implemented method for utilizing demographic information over a network of computers. Among other things, claim 15 recites:

accessing a central demographics server via the network to retrieve demographic information pertaining to a particular registered user, the central demographics server storing demographic information pertaining to a plurality of registered users;

providing the demographic information pertaining to the particular registered user from the central demographics server to a computer associated with the particular registered users; and

subsequently issuing a request to receive a web page from a content server via the network, the request specifying the web page and having the retrieved demographic information associated therewith.

Claim 15, lines 3-11.

Claim 21 recites a computer implemented method for utilizing demographic information over a network of computers. Claim 21, among other things, recites:

accessing a central demographics server via the network to retrieve demographic information pertaining to the requestor, the requestor being previously registered with the central demographics server in a self-represented manner, and the central demographics server storing demographic information pertaining to a plurality of registered users and being accessible by a plurality of different content servers;

providing the retrieved demographic information to the content server;

producing a customized web page response to the request based on the retrieved demographic information;

forwarding the customize web page to the requestor;

forwarding the demographic information from the content server to a user computer;

storing the demographic information on the user computer associated with the requestor;

subsequently receiving another request for another web page at another content server, the demographic information being appended to, part of or provided with the another request;

producing another customized web page response at the another content server based on the demographic information appended to, part of or provided with the another request; and

forwarding the another customized web page to the requestor.

Claim 21, lines 5-24.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 15 and 21 are also patentably distinct from Angles et al., alone or in combination with Minor et al.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 3, 15 and 21 are patentably distinct from Angles et al., alone or in combination with Minor et al. In addition, it is submitted that dependent claims 4, 6, 9, 11-14, 16-20 and 24-27 are also patentably distinct for at least the same reasons. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from Angles et al. and/ or Minor et al. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims under 35 USC §103(a).

#### **INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for partial consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed October 10, 2001. However, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner consider all references so listed, including the non-patent literature. Since, the above-identified application is a continuation of prior application U.S. Patent Application No. 09/021,177. This prior application is being relied upon for an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. § 120, under 37 CFR § 1.98(d) Applicants submit that copies need not be provided.

#### **SUMMARY**

It is submitted that claims 3, 4, 6, 9, 11-21 and 24-27 are patentably distinct from the cited references. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (RLC1G000).

Respectfully submitted,



C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

Telephone: (650) 961-8300